DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 169 443 CG 013 388

AUTHOR Schofield, Janet Ward
TITLE Conceptual Problems in Desegregation Research.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Aug 78
CONTRACT 400-76-0011
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (86th, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, August, 1978); Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary School Students; Elementary Secondary Education; *Integration Effects; Race Relations; *Racial Attitudes; *Racial Differences; *Research Methodology; *Research Problems; *School Integration; Secondary School Students

ABSTRACT

School desegregation has been one of the most controversial issues on the American political scene during the last quarter century and has sparked considerable controversy among researchers as well as among the general public. Although there has been very real disagreement among researchers on a number of specific issues, virtually all recent reviews of the literature on school desegregation agree on one point--that, taken as a whole, the research on the effects of school desegregation on children is quite inconclusive. Conceptual problems have contributed in important ways to the inconclusiveness of the literature on the effect of desegregation on black and white students, particularly in terms of lack of attention paid to the nature of the independent variable, too much focus on outcomes rather than process, insufficient attention to the precise nature of the expected outcomes, and the selection of instruments sensitive to interracial attitudes. (Author/HLM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED169443

CONCEPTUAL PROBLEMS IN DESEGREGATION RESEARCH

Janet Ward Schofield
University of Pittsburgh

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A paper to be presented at the American Psychological Association Conference in Toronto, Canada, August, 1978.

The preparation of the chapter was partially funded through the author's contract #400-76-0011 with the National Institute of Education. However, all opinions expressed herein are solely those of the author and no endorsement of the ideas by NIE is implied or intended.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. W. Schofield

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CG013388

School desegregation has been one of the most controversial issues on the American political scene during the last quarter century. Few other domestic policy issues in recent years have aroused such strong feeling and widespread political activity on the part of vast numbers of Americans. Proponents of desegregation have doggedly pursued litigation against segregated school districts year after year in spite of huge costs and interminable delays. Opponents have sought a constitutional amendment against "forced busing" which would have the practical consequence of severely limiting desegregation. Opposition to desegregation has been the cornerstone of national as well as local political careers and the moving force behind the founding of over 3,000 private academies.

School desegregation has sparked considerable controversy among researchers as well as among the general public. For example, in recent years unusually sharp controversies have arisen in the academic community about the probable effects of desegregation on intergroup relations. Armor (1972) and Pettigrew, Useem, Normand, and Smith (1973) differ dramatically in their interpretation of the data on how desegregation influences racial attitudes. Similarly, the views of Coleman, Kelly, and Moore (1975) on the relation between school desgregation and white flight have been sharply challenged by the work of other researchers (Farley, 1975; Pettigrew and Green, 1976a, 1976b; Rossell, 1975).

Although there has been very real disagreement among researchers on a number of specific issues, virtually all recent reviews of the literature on school desegregation agree on one point - that, taken as a whole, the research on the effects of school desegregation on children is quite inconclusive. (Cohen, 1975; Schofield, 1978, St. John, 1975;

Stephan, 1978) There are a few general conclusions that are rarely contradicted by empirical evidence. For example, school desegregation does not appear to harm the academic progress of either black or white students (St. John, 1975). But contradictory findings about the effects of desegregation on various aspects of students' attitudes and behavior are far more common. For example, St. John (1975) and Schofield (1978) both conclude that the most striking feature of the fairly extensive literature on desegregation and intergroup relations is the inconsistency of its findings. Many studies suggest that desegregation tends to lead to more positive interracial attitudes (Gardner, Wright & Dee, 1970; Jansen & Gallagher, 1966; Mann, 1959; Singer, 1966; U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1967). Others suggest precisely the opposite (Barber, 1968; Dentler & Elkins, 1967; Taylor, 1967). Still others suggest that desegregation has a positive effect on the attitudes of whites and a negative effect on the attitudes of blacks (McWhirt, 1967) or visa-versa (Crooks, 1970; Kurokawa, 1971; Webster, 1961). Finally, some like Lombardi (1952) or Trubowitz (1969) suggest no effect at all.

I shall argue in this paper that conceptual problems have contributed in important ways to the inconclusiveness of the literature on the effect of desegregation on black and white students. Methodological problems, too, have undoubtedly played a part in creating the present rather confused state of affairs. These problems, however, have been reviewed in detail elsewhere and will not be discussed here (St. John, 1975, Schofield, 1978; Stephan, 1978). Rather I shall concentrate on discussing four basic conceptual problems which have plagued desegregation research, for I believe that without attention to these problems even studies

of exceptional methodological rigor will fail to lead to a cumulatively interpretable and useful literature. Further, as will become apparent, a number of the conceptual problems outlined are so intimately related to methodological issues that some aspects of the methodology of desegregation research can not be significantly improved without prior fairly basic conceptual work. The following discussion will be centered specifically around conceptual problems in research on desegregation and intergroup relations. The majority of the points, however, are also applicable to a greater or lesser degree, to other areas of desegregation research.

UNDERDEVELOPMENT AND UNDERUTILIZATION OF THEORY

Contact Theory: An Example

Among social psychologists, the only really widely shared theoretical perspective on desegregation and intergroup relations is that suggested by Allport's (1954) contact theory. Allport's basic thesis is relatively straightforward. He argues that intergroup contact may reinforce previously held stereotypes and increase intergroup hostility unless the contact situation is structured in a way which provides equal status for minority and majority group members and provides strong institutional support for positive relations. Allport also stresses the necessity of cooperative interaction aimed towards the achievement of shared goals. According to Allport, unless these conditions are met, improvement in intergroup relations is unlikely to result.

Building on Allport's work, Pettigrew has argued that it is a mistake to use one word, desegregation, to apply to all types of interracial schooling. He has drawn a distinction between what he calls merely

desegregated schools and genuinely integrated schools. Pettigrew et al (1973, pp. 92-93) write: "Desegregation is achieved by simply ending segregation and bringing blacks and whites together; it implies nothing about the quality of interracial interaction." Integration, on the other hand, is achieved only when Allport's conditions for fostering positive intergroup contact have been met. Pettigrew (1973) argues, for example, that Allport's equal status criterion requires that the integrated school provide equal access to sources of social status as well as to physical facilities and materials. Hence he contends that an integrated school's staff must be interracial at all levels, and that positions which give students formal or informal status, such as student council member or cheerleader, must not be monopolized by either group. Pettigrew also sees strict ability grouping on the basis of test scores as incompatible with the equal status criterion when it leads to heavily resegregated classrooms with differential status. In addition, he stresses the vital importance of the attitudes of school authorities, such as the principal, arguing that positive attitudes about desegregation are crucial to creating the supportive atmosphere which Allport hypothesized was necessary for improved intergroup relations.

Although contact theory is routinely invoked in reports on desegregation research, it has, in actuality, had a remarkably small impact on the design and reporting of that research. For example, contact theory appears to have had extremely little impact on the type of information given in published reports about the effects of desegregation. Researchers often tip their hats to contact theory in the introductory passages of a research report and then fail entirely to give information on topics which the theory suggests

should be vital to predicting the likely outcomes of the interracial experience. Webster's (1961) study is fairly typical in this regard. Webster mentions contact theory in the first paragraph of his study. In discussing his results he states that the criteria specified by contact theory as conducive to positive change were met. However, the extent to which these criteria were actually met in the study is extremely unclear. For example, the only information Webster (1961) gives about authorities' stand on desegregation is that the school board ordered the change in district boundaries which resulted in the desegregation because of overcrowding and socioeconomic status differentials between schools. There is no specific information on the attitudes of others, such as principals or teachers, who could reasonably be argued to be authorities more important than the school board in the eyes of the desegregated junior high school students. In addition, no information is given on the racial composition of the school's staff. Webster's study has been cited to provide a specific example of research which takes a contact theory perspective without supplying data which the perspective would suggest is important. However, many others do precisely the same thing.

Unfortunately, while contact theory is often used to explain the results of studies which find that interracial contact has led to increased friction or to no change, it has rarely been used to structure studies of desegregation's effects. The very few studies which have taken contact theory really seriously have had generally promising results - that is, interracial attitudes or behavior appeared to be related to the conditions of desegregation much as Allport (1954) has suggested. For example, Lachat (1972) studied racial attitudes in an all white, an integrated, and a desegregated high school. Although there was a considerable amount of voluntary segregation in informal social activities in the integrated

school as well as the desgregated one, the white students were almost twice as likely to hold positive attitudes towards blacks in the former school as in the latter (71% v. 37%). Also, Schofield and Sager (1977) found different trends in the amount of interracial interaction in different grades of the same school which were characterized by different classroom assignment policies. In the grade with a low status heavily black track and a high status heavily white track, racial aggregation increased over time. However, it decreased in the non-tracked grade.

Clearly the most ambitious efforts to apply and develop contact theory are those of Steuart Cook and his associates. Cook (1969) reviewed the literature on intergroup relations and concluded that five aspects of the interracial contact situation are especially crucial in determining whether attitudinal change will occur as a result of intergroup contact. Three of these aspects were very similar to Allport's (1954) original contact theory and Pettigrew's (1969b) later discussion of it:

(a) equal status within the setting for members of both groups,

(b) mutual interdependence, and

(c) a social climate which has norms favorable to interracial association.

The two new items added by Cook (1969) were:

(a) the attributes of the disliked group member in the contact situation contradict prevailing stereotyped beliefs, and

(b) the association reveals personal information about the disliked group member so that others interacting with them are encouraged perceive them as individuals.

After isolating the above factors as crucial to attitude change, Cook (1969) carefully went about constructing a contact situation which fulfilled these criteria. The actual procedures are described in detail elsewhere (Cook, 1969). In brief, Cook selected highly prejudiced white college students and then exposed them to a black confederate daily for about four weeks in a experimental situation which the students believed to be a part-time job. Approximately two months after this exposure, subjects were retested for attitude change. Thirty-five percent of Cook's subjects showed a favorable attitude change of one or more standard deviations. (The standard deviation used was based on analysis of the test scores of other college students living in the same town as the experimental subjects). Only one of the 23 subjects showed a clear negative change as did two of the control subjects. A later replication of this study found essentially the same results as the initial study (Cook, 1971). Cook's work is an extraordinarily clear demonstration that planned experiences which incorporate the conditions suggested by contact theory can bring about substantial attitude change. Interestingly, a recent study of intergroup relations in a prison housing unit which replicated reasonably closely the conditions created in Cook's work also found significant decreases in racial prejudice over time (Foley, 1977). However, because studies which test contact theory's predictions about positive change are few and far between, it is difficult to assess how adequately this theory has isolated the variables which effect the outcome of interracial contact. Perhaps an important factor contributing to the underutilization of contact theory in designing research is the fact that the theory itself has not been sufficiently elaborated or refined. Much remains to be done in working out conceptually the referents of the rather general

concepts employed by contact theory. The need for systematic conceptual work on the development and refinement of contact theory can be illustrated by discussion of the very varied ways in which the concept of equal status within the contact situation has been conceptualized. Some social scientists have considered the equal status criterion met when members of both groups have equal access to the same institututions. For example, as mentioned previously, Webster (1961) considered the equal status condition as met when blacks and whites were assigned to attend the same school. However, Pettigrew (1975) emphasizes the importance of equal access to all sources of both formal and informal status. Webster (1961) discusses equal access to the school but says nothing about the racial composition of the school's staff or about internal arrangements such as tracking which clearly affect students' status. Hence, Pettigrew's view of the conditions relevant to the attainment of equal status is considerably more inclusive than the views of others like Webster.

St. John (1975), Cohen (1975) and Armor (1972) have gone a step further and emphasized the difficulty of actually achieving equal status within the contact situation when students bring with them very different backgrounds. Discussing contact theory's requirments for equal status, St. John (1975, p. 98) writes: "Black and white children may be unequally prepared to be successful students or may be accorded unequal status in the peer group because of differential family background." After studying interaction between black and white students, Cohen (1975 p. 294) writes "the inference may be drawn that even though blacks and whites might be brought together in a desegregated school in an "equal status" manner,

it is still quite possible for the racial difference to act as a strong status differential triggering expectations for whites to do better. If this occurs in the school situation, then the racial sterotypes which contribute to these expectations are only reinforced and confirmed by the interracial interaction." As can be seen, in these statements the emphasis is on the way that the characteristics which the group members bring with them influence the development of informal status and consequent intergroup relations.

There is little theoretical or empirical work which suggests which of the very varied sources of equal or unequal status - the law and/or administrative policy, formal organizational structure, or informal structure resulting from status-ralated personal characteristics - is most crucial for the development of intergroup relations. The same lack of clarity about the precise referents of contact theory's general propositions which has been illustrated with this discussion of "equal status" is generally evident in the literature on the other criteria which Allport (1954) specified.

A much needed outgrowth of the conceptual elaboration and refinement suggested above is further thought and research on the way in which the contact theory variables effect intergroup relations individually rather than jointly. Studies such as those reviewed earlier (Cook, 1969, 1971; Lachet, 1972; Schofield and Sagar, 1977) suggest that when all or most of the conditions specified by contact theory are met, attitude or behavioral change tends to occur. However, as Cook (1969) and Weissback (1976) have pointed out, this sort of work does not allow one to determine which of the variables specified by contact theory, or which combinations of these variables, are instrumental in bringing about the changes that do occur.

A vigorous beginning of a trend toward investigating the operation of the contact theory variables singlely is evident both in recent

theorizing about equal status and in the studies on the effect of cooperative dependence on relations between black and white students. For example, Amir (1976) has questioned whether equal status is indeed a sine qua non for improved intergroup relations or whether it is merely one possible way of achieving this goal. Also, a number of investigators have begun to ask whether cooperative dependence can, by itself, improve intergroup relations (Aronson, Blarney, Sikes, Stephan, and Snapp, 1975; DeVries and Edwards, 1974; Johnson, Johnson and Scott, in press; Slavin, 1977; Slavin and Madden, 1978; Weigel, Wiser, and Cook, 1975; Witte, 1972). Studies of the effects of cooperative dependence generally show improved intergroup attitudes or increased interaction although some show little or no change. However, it is very important to note that unlike many other studies of mere contact they do not find negative results. This suggests that cooperative dependence is, as contact theory suggests, conducive to the development of positive intergroup relations. Nonetheless, the mixed results also suggest the need for further exploration of why and how cooperative dependence operates to influence intergroup attitudes. Study of the operation of the other variables specified by contact theory has hardly been begun but is much needed.

Other Theoretical Perspectives:

The extended discussion of contact theory was not meant by any means to imply that it is the only theoretical perspective on desegregation and intergroup relations. A number of other perspectives such as Berger, Cohen and Zelditch's (1966, 1972) theory of status characteristics and expectation states have been developed specifically to explain intergroup relations. Furthermore, occassional researchers have applied ideas from perspectives as diverse as reinforcement theory

and attribution theory to illuminating processes which effect race relations (Duncan, 1977; Williams, 1972). None of these perspectives has, however, generated large amounts of research which help to illuminate what occurs in interracial schools. Hence, it is widely agreed that both refining our present theoretical perspectives and developing new perspectives would be most helpful in moving desegregation research forward from its present rather muddled state.

PROBLEMS IN CONCEPTUALIZING DESEGREGATION

Lack of Attention to The Nature of The Independent Variable: What Defines Desegregation?

As I see it, one of the major reasons for the apparent inconsistency of the results of research on desegregation is that researchers have studied vastly different situations all of which have been subsumed under one term-desegregation. Most researchers are not in a position to create instances of desegregation which embody precisely the characteristics they see as crucial to the concept or to control for or eliminate unwanted aspects of the situation they are studying. Typically, they hear about instances of interracial mixing in the schools which are occurring somewhere in their general locale and they try to gain access to the appropriate schools for study. Hence, there is often little motivation to go through the conscious step of deciding how one can best conceptualize and operationalize the variable desegregation, for the practical problems involved in finding and gaining access to a site or sites which embody these characteristics are often overwhelming. Furthermore, the lack of refined and elaborated theoretical perspectives concerning just what desegregation is and how it relates to

various student outcomes, means that the researcher has no standard set of concepts to use in determining the extent to which the situation truly is desegregated.

The social situations which our society labels as desegregated vary to an extraordinary extent. The problem is, as Cohen (1975, p. 274) points out, that "desegregation is a political-legal concept, used in widely differing ways by different courts. And when researchers attempt to locate settings in which to study desegregation, they too differ as to what constitutes desegregation." Schools which are considered desegregated in one study might well be considered segregated in another. For example, Singer (1966) classifies a school which is 80% black as segregated whereas Porter (1971) analyzes racial attitudes in a "token desegregated school" which is over 95% white. Kurokawa (1971) compares a "white" school to a "mixed school." Although he does not give the precise proportion of whites, blacks, and Japanese Americans at these two schools, he obtained one-third of his minority group sample from the "white" school which clearly means that it was not entirely white.

Obviously, the most basic criterion used by researchers and the courts in deciding whether a school is desegregated is the racial mix of the student body. However, other factors clearly come into play For example, previously white schools which receive bussed blacks are often called desegregated, even though they are less than 5% black (Useem, 1976; Rist, 1978). Such schools would undoubtedly be classified as segregated if they were located in an area with a substantial black population whose children attended heavily black schools. Hence, the demographic characteristics of the community surrounding the school appear to influence what black/white ratio is considered segregated or desegregated.

Wershauer and Dantler (1967) have suggested that a school should be considered desegregated only if the percentage of students of each group in the student body is between 50% and 200% of that group's representation in the entire community. To make matters even more complicated, the race of the group which predominates in the school appears to influence the mathematical proportion of students required to achieve a situation which is called desegregation. For example, a school which is 70% black is almost sure to be perceived as a "black" school, whereas a school which is 70% white would generally be perceived as desegregated (Sagar & Schofield, 1978).

Research has quite clearly shown the ratio of blacks to whites in a desegregated situation is related to intergroup attitudes. (Dentler & Elkins, 1967; McPartland, 1968; St. John & Lewis, 1975; U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1967). There is also some evidence that interracial friendship patterns are influenced by whether black students attend a desegregated neighborhood school or a more distant desegregated school (St. John & Lewis, 1975; Willie, 1973). Hence, it seems likely that the wide variation in the particular racial mix of the schools studied and in the schools' community settings contributes substantially to making it difficult to draw any overall conclusions about the impact of desegregation on interracial attitudes and behavior.

Differential Implementation of Similar Desegregation Programs:

Recent work in the field of evaluation research suggests other factors which also contribute importantly to making the desegregation literature

inconclusive and diffilult to interpret. Evaluative researchers stress the importance of recognizing that programs vary tremendously in the degree to which and the way in which they are implemented (Cook & Campbell, 1976; Guttentag & Struening, 1975). Thus, even if one program looks superficially like another one cannot safely assume that they actually take similar shape. Even if the instances of desegregation studied were similar with respect to the ratios of blacks to whites in the schools and the surrounding communities, there would probably still be such substantial differences between the situations that they might be expected to produce widely varying results. For example, some schools clearly distribute black and white students throughout their classes in proportions roughly similar to their proportion in the school (Schofield, 1976). However, others resegregate black and white students within the school building (National Institute of Education, 1977). Hence, one desegregated school with 30% black students might have these students distributed equally in all classes. Another school might informally resegregate its classes so that students would have little or no classroom contact with students of the other group. It is reasonable to speculate that these two schools could have entirely different effects on the intergroup attitudes of their students with the resegregated school reinforcing prejudiced attitudes and tendencies toward in-group choice. Indeed, a study by Koslin, Amarel, and Ames (1969) found less racial polarization in classrooms which closely reflected the racial balance of the school they were in than in classrooms where the racial composition differed from that of the school. Interestingly, in spite of the fact that almost a decade has passed since Cook (1969) drew attention to the importance of the contact situation's acquaintance potential, extremely

few published research reports give even crude information on this topic. Cohen (1975), who reviewed the literature on school desegregation and intergroup relations, notes that only one-fifth of the studies done between 1968 and 1974 reported on whether there was actual interracial contact in the classrooms of the schools studied.

The fact that even instances of desegregation which appear similar on the surface may differ markedly in crucial aspects of implementation such as the extent of actual interracial contact has important implications for the interpretation of large scale studies which analyze outcome variables in a number of segregated and desegregated schools and conclude that desegregation has no impact. Indeed, it could be that desegregation has an impact which is masked because of the tremendous variance due to other uncontrolled variables. Or, alternatively, the positive impact of desegregation in some schools' classrooms might be counterbalanced by the negative impact in others. Sometimes investigators recognize this sort of problem. For example, in a chapter titled "Effects of Desegregation on Achievement-Related Motivation," Biener and Gerard (1975, p. 146) write: "Our statistical design allowed us to examine differences between samples of minority children at different points ... -zero years in the receiving schools, versus one year, versus three years - controlling for variations in response due to age and sex within each group. Considering the large amount of uncontrolled variability in the children's actual school experience, it is surprising that we found any differences at all." However, more often the problem is completely ignored.

Variations in the Context of Desegregation Efforts

In addition to suggesting that the conclusion of "no effect" drawn by some studies may be incorrect, the work of evaluative researchers also suggests

why findings of "some effect" vary so greatly in their conclusions about the nature of that effect. Guttentag (1973, p.61) writes: "Programs really are the inverse of the carefully designed and manipulated single variables of the experimental paradigm. And whereas the measurement of outcomes tactily assumes that the social setting of the program -- the when, where, and how a program is administered, and so forth -- accounts for less of the variance than treatment effects, this is likely not to be the case at all."

Thus even instances of desegregation which appear roughly equivalent in terms of black/white ratios and implementation strategies may have very different effects depending on the context in which they occur. The huge variations in the context of instances of desegregation which have been studied can be illustrated by brief discussion of the studies cited by St. John's (1975) review. Some of the early studies reviewed by St. John were carried out when laws requiring racial segregation were still in effect and strictly enforced in parts of this country (Criswall, 1939; Kupferer, 1954; Lundberg & Dickson, 1952). Others were conducted during the surge of militant integrationist civil rights activity in the 1960's (Dentler and Elkins, 1967; McPartland, 1968). Still other studies were done in the 1970's after Presidents Nixon and Ford, as well as some prominent black leaders, had seriously reopened the issue of whether integration was a desirable goal. (Eddy, 1975; Schofield & Sagar, 1977). Also, the region of the country in which these studies were conducted varies from southern states like North Carolina and Kentucky to northern states like New York and Massachusetts to western states such as Oklahoma and California. Cohen (1975) points out that at present we do not know what specific changes in our social history constitute factors likely to effect the desegregation process and its impact on students. However, the importance of social context

factors like region or historical era is suggested by St. John's (1975) conclusion that studies performed in the South, which also tend to be early studies, are more liekly than those performed in the North to find that desegregation negatively invluences interracial attitudes. The work of Robert Coles (1968) also suggests that social context can play a vital role in affecting children's reactions to desegregated schooling.

Variation in the Participants in the Desegregation Program

School desegregation varies widely not only in the "how," "when," and "where" of its implementation but also in the "who," the characteristics of the students involved. For example, studies of school desegregation and interracial attitudes and behavior have been conducted in settings ranging from nursery schools (Porter, 1971) through high schools (Useem, 1976). In addition, both the absolute and the relative social class of the black and white students involved vary widely. Reviews of the literature suggest that factors such as age, sex, and social class are related to students' reactions to desegregation (Carithers, 1970; Cohen, 1975; St. John, 1975). Often these factors appear to have interactive effects. For example, although black girls seem to find desegregation more difficult than black boys, the reverse may be true for whites (Patchen, Davidson, Hofmann & Brown, 1977; Schofield & McGivern, 197 Singer, 1966; Yarrow, Campbell & Yarrow, 1958). Not surprisingly, behavior in desegregated schools appears to be related to personal factors such as students' aggressiveness and initial racial attitudes. (Patchen, et.al., 1977). One might expect that such factors would also influence the rate and direction of change in interracial attitudes and behavior. Hence, it seems unwise to search for "the effect" of desegregation. One would expect different outcomes

depending on the particular situation. In addition, even within a particular setting, a host of variables such as age, sex, and minority or majority group membership might be expected to influence how a student reacts to the desegregated experience.

FOCUS ON A NARROW RANGE OF OUTCOMES RATHER THAN PROCESS

Typically researchers studying desegregated schools have tried to assess the effects of desegregation without simultaneously exploring the social processes which might account for these effects (Cohen, 1978; National Institute of Education, 1974; Schofield, 1978; St. John, 1975). The lack of attention traditionally given in the desegregation research literature to classroom social process is striking. This point is well illustrated by the fact that in his discussion of "the dynamics of the interracial classroom," Pettigrew (1967) cites just three major studies or groups of studies. Two of these, the Equality of Educational Opportunity survey (Coleman, et al, 1966) and Racial Isolation in the Public Schools (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1967), were, as Pettigrew (1967, p.285) notes, broad-gauged surveys which, though they can describe and staistically relate variables, "can only hint at the basic... processes at work." The third group of studies, reported in Katz (1964), is much more useful in understanding the dynamics in interracial interaction since biracial groups were observed in a variety of experimental situations. Katz's work suggests that the academic performance of black Americans in biracial situations may be influenced by four factors: lowered probability of success, social threat, failure threat, and a social facilitation effect. However, the persons participating in Katz's experiments were primarily

college age or older. Hence, it is unclear how well his findings about interracial social processes would apply to a schoolroom situation with students of a very different age. As a matter of fact, later work by Katz and his colleagues (Katz, Henchy & Allen, 1968) suggests that the social facilitation effect observed in the earlier experiments did not operate for black children in a ghetto elementary school.

The focus on desegregation's effects has undoubtedly stemmed at least partially from the fact that researchers and funding agencies have often hoped to use the results of the research in political ways to support or, less frequently, to undermine the national policy of school desegregation. Obviously, for political purposes it is much more useful to be able to say that desegregation improves or harms intergroup relations than to delineate the processes which may lead to these results.

The heavy emphasis on effects to the exclusion of process is an especially severe problem because desegregation research tends to be non-experimental and does not lend itself well from a statistical point of view to unambiguous causal statements. Given this state of affairs, the causal statements that are made would be much more convincing if one could demonstrate processes that occur in the desegregated setting and plausible links between the processes and the outcomes which are found (Suchman, 1967). A few researchers have recognized the importance of exploring mediating processes. For example, Gerard and Miller (1975) focused part of their massive study of desegregated schools in Riverside, California on exploring the frequently mentioned but rarely tested idea that the academic achievement of minority students in desegregated schools may be stimulated through the "lateral transmission

of values;" that is, such students may be influenced to work diligently by their achievement-oriented majority group peers. The data did not give much support to the lateral transmission of values hypothesis. Hence, Gerard and Miller suggest that other mediating processes should be explored

The need for attention to the social processes which occur in desegregated schools was recognized in 1974 by the National Institute of Education which decided to fund several researchers interested in ethnographic work on this subject. Qualitative ethnographic work was seen as being especially suited to the task of developing grounded theories of how social processes operate to influence the development of black and white students in desegregated schools. Five studies funded by N.I.E. have just been completed (Clement, Eisenhart, Harding & Livesay, 1977; Collins & Noblit, 1977; Ianni, Sullivan, Orr, Henry & Mavros, 1977; Scherer & Slawski, 1977; Schofield, 1977). They, along with a few other such studies like Rist's (1978) and Willie's (1973) work constitute a rich base from which further quantitative work might start.

LACK OF ATTENTION TO THE PRECISE NATURE OF THE OUTCOMES EXPECTED

In addition to paying insufficient attention to the exact nature of the independent variable, desegregation, and the mediating effect of social processes within the school, desegregation research has often paid insufficient attention to delineating precisely what effects one might reasonably expect interracial schools to have on students. Perhaps a prime example of this problem is found in the literature on desegregation and intergroup attitudes and behavior.

Assumption That Negative and Positive Relations Can be Conceptualized Along One Continuum:

Scholars working in the area of desegregation and intergroup relations have tended to conceptualize negative and positive intergroup relations as being the two end points on a continuum. In recent years, they also have often tended to concentrate on the positive end of that continuum, measuring such things as friendship choice or the degree of positive association in which individuals engage. Yet the rather sparce data available suggest that positive and negative relations may be quite unrelated. One of the very rare studies which addresses this issue found that self-reports of friendly contact were almost completely unrelated to self-reports of avoidance or unfriendly contact, with correlations between these types of behaviors ranging from $r = .00$ to $r = -.22$ (Patchen, Davidson, Hoffman & Brown, 1977). Furthermore, this same study found that friendly contact was predicted by a very different set of variables than unfriendly contact. If positive and negative behavior are as independent as the work of Patchen et al suggests, researchers need to be much more careful than they have typically been in the past choosing their measures of intergroup relations and in generalizing from measures which have investigated only positive or negative intergroup relations.

Conceptual Problems With the Use of Friendship Choice as a Measure of Intergroup Relations

Sociometric measures are very widely used for assessing the impact of desegregation on intergroup relations. Typically, children are asked to give the names of a very small number of other children who are their most preferred

companions for various types of activities. These measures have been utilized with interesting and informative results in a number of studies such as Gerard & Miller's (1975) study of desegregation in Riverside, California and St. John & Lewis' (1975) work in Boston. There are, however, a number of often overlooked problems with the utilization of these measures to assess change in intergroup relations. First, since the measures most typically ask children to name their three most preferred companions, they give information on the child's closest friends or most preferred partners but are generally insensitive to changes in patterns of social interaction which do not involve the development of especially strong positive relationships. Cohen (1975, p. 273) has written: "The mechanism of desegregation is not intended to create universal love and brotherhood. The goal of the desegregation process is a reasonable degree of social integration and a lack of overt conflict whereby blacks and whites, given an objective important to both, can trust each other and listen to each other sufficiently well to complete the task at hand, whether it be a vocational task, an educational task, or a political task." To the extent that one accepts Cohen's argument, sociometric techniques seem to measure an outcome which though desirable is not of the highest priority. Obviously, this is not a criticism of the sociometric technique per se. Rather, it is a suggestion that sociometric techniques tap a specific type of behavior which from the point of view of social policy is less crucial than many other types of intergroup behavior.

In addition, it should be noted that the most frequently used sociometric techniques tend to tap behaviors which are relatively unlikely to change over

short periods of time. For example, it seems reasonable to expect that a child who initially avoids playing with members of an outgroup would become willing to play cooperatively with outgroup members if a conductive situation should arise long before he or she would ever select an outgroup member as a playmate when allowed to single out a few special friends. In addition, the majority of the desegregation studies have been conducted in schools where desegregation stems from the transfer of children from one school to another rather than from residential desegregation. There is evidence suggesting that new children in a school, regardless of their race, do not immediately become fully integrated into the peer network (St. John & Lewis, 1975; Willie, 1973). Hence, it seems unrealistic to expect that sociometric techniques would indicate marked changes in interracial behavior in the space of a year or less even if the school came close to meeting Allport's (1954) criteria. Unfortunately, since studies of intergroup behavior in desegregated schools very rarely use measures of behavior which may be more rapidly influenced by interracial contact, generalizations about the effect of desegregation are based almost exclusively on the study of this one particular type of behavior which is relatively resistant to change.

Finally, peer nomination sociometric measures which restrict the number of choices a child can make, operate on a zero-sum model of intergroup relations (Sagar, 1977). The addition of an outgroup member to the list requires the deletion of an ingroup member. (Of course, one could substitute one outgroup member for another, but since the information used by the researcher is the group membership of the students chosen rather than their individual identity, this sort of substitution would not effect the conclusions drawn from the data.) Typically, sociometric studies share this questionable

zero-sum structure with such traditionally popular but now such criticized measures of racial preference as Clark's classic doll choice technique. These techniques allow outgroup choice, but each such choice requires rejection of the ingroup. As Sagar (1977) points out, the structure of these methods builds in a negative correlation between assessed liking for blacks and whites. The empirical data on the relationship of liking for black and whites suggests a very different picture (Smith, Williams & Willis, 1967; Paige, 1970).

Lack of Sufficient Attention to the Complexity of Intergroup Attitudes

Researchers studying desegregation have tended to use fairly simple measures of interracial affect or belief and then to generalize about the effect of desegregation on interracial attitudes. This procedure, however, has an important weakness which has become apparent in the last decade. There is good evidence that interracial attitudes are organized into specific content areas, some of which are quite unrelated to others. (Brigham, Woodmansee & Cook, 1976; Woodmansee & Cook, 1967). So, for example, generalizing from an instrument which measures friendship choice to other areas, such as attitudes toward desegregation or even derogatory beliefs about the outgroup in general, may be quite unwanted. Indeed, there are a number of pieces of scattered data which suggest that interracial contact may have quite opposite effects on various aspects of students' interracial attitudes. For example, Singer (1966) found that white students in a desegregated school expressed more positive affect on a measure of interracial attitudes than did their segregated peers. However, they also rated blacks as more aggressive and less likely to perform well academically than did the segregated whites. Similarly, in a study of students in a desegregated middle school, Schofield (1977) concluded that although the

liking of white students for black students increased over time, the white students' negative stereotypes of blacks were actually strengthened. In sum, the lack of attention which desegregation research has given to the rather complex na of intergroup attitudes and to the varied effects interracial experiences may have on different aspects of childrens' feelings and beliefs is unfortunate.

Desegregation researchers have also often been less than ideally sensitive to the fact that blacks' and whites' interracial attitudes may be organized cognitively in quite different ways. One can view this as a methodological problem if it means that the instruments used to assess intergroup relations are more valid or reliable for one group than the other. But whatever methodogical problems there are in this case stem from a basic conceptual problem - assuming without empirical validation that race does not influence the typical structure of attitudes or the nature of the relation between cognitions and affect. The few studies which have directly explored the issue of whether racial attitudes are structured similarly in blacks and whites suggest there may be differences. For example, Patchen, Hofmann and Davidson (1976) found clear differences in the factor structure of the interracial perceptions of white and black high school students. Black students tended to have a more differentiated structure to their perceptions than did whites who tended to see blacks in terms of a general positive or negative dimension.

SUMMARY

This essay has discussed four basic conceptual problems which appear to have played a significant role in contributing to the present rather inconclusive state of the literature on desegregation and intergroup relations. First, the literature has been largely atheoretical. Although contact theory has received considerable lip service as the guiding perspective for much desegregation research for nearly a quarter of a century, it is surprisingly undeveloped. Other theories, while often promising, have not been widely utilized by researchers studying desegregation. Second, researchers have often failed to give sufficient thought to the exact nature of the phenomenon of desegregation and to specifying which aspects of the phenomenon are linked to which outcomes. This problem is very closely linked to the lack of theoretical work discussed previously. Third, although there are some recent and encouraging exceptions, on the whole studies of desegregation have not paid sufficient attention to the social processes occurring in desegregated schools. Finally, the specification and conceptualization of likely outcomes of desegregated schooling and the selection of instruments which are sensitive to the richness and complexity of interracial attitudes needs considerably more work.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allport, G.W. The Nature of Prejudice. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison - Wesley, 1954.

Amir, Y. The role of intergroup contact in change of prejudice and ethnic relations In P. Katz (ed.), Towards the Elimination of Racism. New York: Pergamon Press, 1976.

Armor, D.J. The evidence on bussing. Public Interest, summer 1972, pp. 90-124.

Aronson, E., Blaney, N., Sikes, J., Stephan, C., & Snapp, M. Bussing and racial tension. The jigsaw route to learning and liking. Psychology Today, February, 1975, pp. 43-120

Barber, B.W. The effects of open enrollment on anti-negro and anit-white prejudices among junior high students in Rochester, New York. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Rochester, 1968.

Berger, J., Cohen, E., & Zelditch, M. Status characteristics and expectation states In J. Berger, M. Zelditch & B. Anderson (Eds.), Sociological Theories in Progress. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1966.

Berger, J., Cohen, E., & Zelditch, M. Status conceptions and social interaction. American Sociological Review, 1972, 37, 241-255.

Biener, L., Gerard, H. Effects of desegregation on achievement - relevant motivatic In H. Gerard and N. Miller, School Desegregation. New York: Plenum, 1975.

Brigham, J.C., Woodmansee, J.J., & Cook, S.W. Dimensions of verbal radical attitude interracial marriage and approaches to racial equality. Journal of Social Issu 32 (2), 1976.

Carithers, M.W. School desegregation and racial change, 1954-1970: A review of the literature. Journal of Social Issues, 1970, 26 (4), 25-47.

Clement, D., Eisenhart, M., Harding, J., & Livesay, J.M. The Emerging Order: An Ethnography of A Southern Desegregated School. Final Draft. Available from D. Clement, Dept of Anthropology, University of North Carolina, Chapel-Hill, N.C. 27514, October, 1977.

Cohen, E. The effects of desegregation on race relations. Law and Contemporary Problems, 1975, 39 (2), 271-299.

Cohen, E., and Deslonde, J.L. The desegregated school: problems in status, power, and interracial climate. 1978. Available from E. Cohen, Center for Educational-vocational research, Stanford University, Stanford, Calif. 94305.

Coleman, J.S. Kelly, S.D., & Moore, J.A. Recent Trends in School Desegregation. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C., April, 1975.

Coles, R. Northern children under desegregation. Psychiatry, 1968, 31 (1), 1-15.

Collins, T., & Noblit, G. Stratification and Resegregation: The Case of Crossover High School. Contract #400-76-009 with the Field Studies in Urban Desegregated Schools Program of the National Institute of Education. 1978. Available from Dept. of Anthropology, Memphis State University, Memphis, Tennessee 38125.

Cook, S.W. Motives in a conceptual analysis of attitude-related behavior. In W.J. Arnold & D. Levine (Eds.) Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1969.

Cook, S. The effect of unintended interracial contact upon racial interaction and attitude change. (Project No. 5-1320), Final Report, U.S. Office of Education, August 1971, Mimeo.

Cook, T., & Compbell, D. The design and conduct of quasi-experiments and true experiments in field settings. In M. Dunnettee, Handbook of Organizational Psychology, Chicago, Illinois: Rand-McNally, 1976.

Criswall, J.H. A sociometric study of racial change in the classroom. Archives of Psychology, No. 235. New York, 1939.

Crooks, B.C. The effects of an interracial preschool program upon racial preference, knowledge of racial differences and racial identification. Journal of Social Issues, 1970, 26 (4), 137-144.

Dentler, R.A. & Elkins, C. Intergroup attitudes, academic performance, and racial composition. In R.A. Dentler, B. Mackler, & M. Warshauer (Eds.), The Urban R's. New York: Praeger, 1967.

DeVires, D. & Edwards, K. Student teams and learning games. Their effects on cross-race and cross-sex interaction. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1974, 66, 741-749.

Duncan, B. Differential social perceptions and attributions of intergroup violence: Testing the lower limits of stereotyping of blacks. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1977, 34 (4), 590-598.

Eddy, E. Educational innovation and desegregation: A case study of symbolic realignment. Human Organization, 1975, 34 (2), 163-172.

Farley, R. Residential segregation and its implications for school integration. Law and Contemporary Problems, 1975, 39 (2), 104-193.

Foley, L. Personality and situational influences on changes in prejudices: A replication of Cook's railroad game in a field setting. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 34 (5), 846-856.

Gardner, B.B., Wright, B.D., Sister Rita Dee. The effects of busing black ghetto children into white suburban schools, 1970. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 048 389).

Gerard, H. & Miller, N. School desegregation. New York: Plenum Press, 1975.

Guttentag, M. Subjectivity and its use in evaluation research. Evaluation, 1973, 1 (2), 60-65.

Guttentag, M. & Struening, E. The handbook: Its purpose and organization. In M. E. Struening (Eds.). Handbook of evaluation research (Vol. 2). Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1975.

Ianni, F., Sullivan, M., Orr, M., Henry, S., Mavros, J. A Field Study of Culture Contact and Desegregation in an Urban High School. Final draft report. Available from Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute, Teachers' College, Columbia University, New York, New York 10027.

Jansen, V.G. & Gallagher, J.J. The social choices of students in racially integrated classes for the culturally disadvantaged talented. Exceptional Children. 1966, 33, 222-226.

Johnson, D.W., Johnson, R.T., and Scott, L. The effects of cooperative and individualized instruction on student attitudes and achievement. Journal of Social Psychology, in press.

Katz, I. Review of evidence relating to effects of desegregation on the performance of Negros. American Psychologist, 1964, 19, 381-399.

Katz, I., Henchy, T., & Allen, H. Effects of race of tester approval - disapproval and need on Negro children's learning. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 8 (1), 38-42.

Koslin, S., Amarel, M. & Ames, N. A distance measure of racial attitudes in primary grade children: An exploratory study. Psychology in the schools, 1969, 6, 382-385.

Kupferer, H.J. An evaluation of the integration potential of a physical education program. Journal of Educational Sociology, October 1954, 28, 89-96.

Kurokawa, M. Mutual perceptions of racial images: White, Black and Japanese-Americans. Journal of Social Issues, 1971, 27 (4), 213-235.

Lachat, M. A description and comparison of the attitudes of white high school seniors towards black Americans in three suburban high schools: An all white a desegregated and an integrated school. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1972.

Lombardi, D.N. Factors affecting changes in attitudes toward Negroes among high school students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Fordham University, 1962

Lundberg, G.A. & Dickson, L. Selective association among ethnic groups in a high school population. American Sociological Review, February 1952, 17, 23-35.

McPartland, J. The segregated student in desegregated schools: Sources of influence on Negro secondary students. (Report No. 21). Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools, Baltimore, Maryland. The Johns Hopkins University, 1968.

McWhirt, R.A. The effects of desegregation on prejudice, academic aspiration and the self-concept of tenth grade students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of South Carolina, 1967.

Mann, J.H. The effects of inter-racial contact on sociometric choices and perception. Journal of Social Psychology, 1959, 50, 143-152.

National Institute of Education: Field studies in urban desegregated schools (RFF NIE-R-75-0023). Washington, D.C., 1974.

National Institute of Education. Resegregation: A Second Generation School Desegregation Issue. A paper prepared by the desegregation studies unit, National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education, & Walfare, Washington, D.C., Feb. 1977.

Paige, J.M. Changing patterns of anit-white attitudes toward blacks. Journal of Social Issues, 1970, 26 (4), 69-86.

Patchen, M., Davidson, J., Hofmann, G., & Brown, W. Interracial perceptions among students. In Sociometry, December, 1976, 39 (4), pp. 341-354.

Patchen, M., Davidson, J., Hofmann, G. & Brown, W. Determinants of students' interracial behavior and opinion change. Sociology of Education, 1977, 50 (1), 55-

Pettigrew, T. Social evaluation theory: Convergences and applications. In D. Lev (Ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation (Vol. 15). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1967.

Pettigrew, T. Racially separate or together. Journal of Social Issues, 1969b, 25 (1), 43-68.

Pettigrew, T. The racial integration of the schools. Taken from Racial Discrimination in the United States, by Thomas F. Pettigrew, (Ed.) Harper & Row: New York, 1975, 225-239.

Pettigrew, T. & Green, R. A reply to professor Coleman. Harvard Educational Review, 1976b, 46 (2), 225-233.

Pettigrew, T., & Green, R. School desegregation in large cities: A critique of Coleman 'White Flight' thesis. Harvard Educational Review, 1976a, 46 (1), 1-53.

Pettigrew, T., Useem, E., Normand, C., & Smith, M., Bussing: A review of the evidence. Public Interest, Winter 1973, 88-118.

Porter, J.D. Black child-white child. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971

Rist, R. The Invisible Children. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1978.

Rossell, C. School desegregation and white flight. Political Science Quarterly, 1975-76, 90, 675-695.

Sagar, H.A. Interracial contact in the public schools: Theory, research and application. Unpublished manuscript, 1977. (Available from Dept. of Psychology, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA. 15260.

Sagar, H.A., & Schofield, J.W. Integrating the desegregated school: Perspectives, Problems and Promise. Unpublished manuscript, 1976. (Available from J. Schofield, Dept. of Psychology, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA. 15215).

St. John, N. School desegregation: Outcomes for children. New York: Wiley, 1975

St. John, N. & Lewis, R. Race and the social structure of the elementary classroom Sociology of Education, summer 1975, 346-348.

Scherer, J. & Slawski, E. Hard Walls - - Soft Walls: The Social Ecology of an Urban Desegregated High School. Final Draft Report funded by N.I.E. contract No. 400-76-0010. Available from J. Scherer, Dept. of Sociology, Oakland Univ., Rochester, MI 48063.

Schofield,J.W. Ethnographic study of a "nearly integrated" middle school. Unpublished manuscript, 1976. (Available from University of Pittsburgh, Dept. of Psychology, Pittsburgh, PA 15260).

Schofield,J.W. Peer nomination v. ranking on sociometric tests. Unpublished manuscript, University of Pittsburgh, 1977. (Available from University of Pittsburgh, Dept. of Psychology, Pittsburgh, PA 15260).

Schofield, J.W. School desegregation and intergroup relations. In D. Bar-Tal and L. Saxe (Eds.) Social Psychology of Education: Theory and Research, Washington, D.C.: Hemisphere Press, 1978.

Schofield, J.W., & Sagar, H.A. Peer interaction patterns in an integrated middle school. Sociometry, 1977a, 40 (2), 130-138.

Singer, D. Interracial attitudes of Negro and white fifth grade children in segregated and unsegregated schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1966.

Slavin, Robert E. Student team learning techniques: Narrowing the achievement gap between the races. Center for the Social Organization of Schools - The Johns Hopkins University, Report Number 228, May, 1977.

Slavin, R. & Madden, N. Race relations in desegregated schools: An activist perspective. Unpublished manuscript. Center for the Social Organization of Schools. Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, 1978.

Smith, C., Williams, L., & Willis, R. Race, sex, and belief as determinants of friendship acceptance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5, 127-134.

Suchman, E.A. Evaluative research: Principles and practice in public service and social action programs. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1967.

Stephan, W.G. School desegregation: An evaluation of predictions made in Brown v. Board of Education. Psychological Bulletin, 1978, 85, 217-238.

Taylor, C.P. Some changes in self-concept in the first year of desegregated schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Delaware, 1967.

Trubowitz, J. Changing the racial attitudes of children. New York: Praeger, 1969

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Racial isolation in the public schools. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

Useem, E.L. White suburban secondary students in schools with desegregation: Correlates of racial attitudes. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1971.

Warshauer, M.E. & Dentler, R.A. A new definition of school desegregation. In R.A. Dentler, B. Mackler, & M.E. Warshauer (Eds.), The Urban R's, New York, Praeger, 1967..

Webster, S.W. The influence of interracial contact on social acceptance in a newly integrated school. Journal of Educational Psychology. December, 1961, 52, 292-2

Weigel, R., Wiser, P., & Cook, S. The impact of cooperative learning on cross-ethnic relations and attitudes. Journal of Social Issues, 1975, 31 (1), 219-243.

Weissback, T.A. Laboratory controlled studies of change of racial attitudes. In P. Katz (Ed.). Towards the elimination of racism. New York: Pergamon Press, 1976.

Williams, J.E. Racial attitudes in preschool children: Modification via operant conditioning, and revised measurement procedure. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Assoc., Honolulu, Sept. 1972.

Willie, C. Race Mixing in the public schools. New York: Praeger, 1973.

Witte, P. The effects of group reward structure on interracial acceptance peer tutoring and academic performance. Unpublished dissertation. Washington,University, 1972.

Woodmansee, J.J. & Cook, S.V. Dimensions of verbal racial attitudes: Their identification and measurement. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 7, 240-250.